

cosmopolitan. The concept of a 'local species or taxon' is meaningless with regard to these animals. For example, *Paramecium caudatum* is morphologically and genetically similar throughout the world, even between continents such as Asia and Australia that have been separated for hundreds of millions of years.

I agree also that the lack of proper type material is causing great problems for colleagues working in a number of fields that relate to protozoan animals. Most described taxa do not have type material preserved. In some cases no material was retained and in other cases where material is available it is often poorly preserved and useless for identification.

In my opinion, Article 75.3.6 should be interpreted flexibly for protozoans and especially for free-living ciliates. This article should not become a barrier to the preparation where necessary of ciliate neotypes that will provide stability to the taxonomy and nomenclature of this important group of animals.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the generic names *Porites* Link, 1807, *Galaxea* Oken, 1815, *Mussa* Oken, 1815 and *Dendrophyllia* Blainville, 1830 (Anthozoa, Scleractinia)**

(Case 2900; see BZN 52: 142–147, 328–329)

Mark J. Grygier

*Lake Biwa Museum, Oroshimo 1091, Kusatsu, Shiga 525–0001, Japan*

I sympathize with the intent of Prof Potts's application. The DENDROPHYLLIIDAE are the dominant coral reef-dwelling hosts of the PETRARCIDAE, parasitic crustaceans that belong to my major group of interest, the Ascothoracida. Nonetheless, the Commission cannot properly act upon these proposals without a clear demonstration that the consequences of following the Code are intolerable. Examination of relevant literature kindly made available to me by Dr S.D. Cairns (*Smithsonian Institution*) shows that some parts of the application are unnecessary. In particular, the following points were not addressed by Prof Potts:

1. If *Porites* Link, 1807 is rejected as a junior homonym, what is the next available synonym to replace it (see Article 23.3.5 of the Code)? Has the next available synonym ever been widely used and how widely is it known now?

According to the synonymy provided by Wells (1956, p. F393), *Stylaraea* Milne-Edwards & Haime, 1851 is the next junior synonym of *Porites* Link, 1807, although only questionably. In fact, this genus, with a single living species, is generally regarded as separate from *Porites* within the PORITIDAE (see Veron, 1986, p. 234). If synonymy with *Stylaraea* is rejected, then *Cosmoporites* Duchaissing & Michelotti, 1860 and *Neoporites* Duchaissing & Michelotti, 1860 (published simultaneously) are the next and apparently only other junior synonyms available. Neither of these names has ever enjoyed the widespread usage hitherto accorded to *Porites* Link, and it would probably be undesirable to replace *Porites* with one of them.

2. If *Porites* Link, 1807 is rejected as a junior homonym of *Porites* Cuvier, 1798, the family name PORITIDAE Gray, 1842 must be replaced by the next available junior synonym or, lacking any, a name based on the replacement generic name (see Article 39). If there is an available junior synonym, what is it, has it ever been widely used, and how widely is it known now?

I have been unable to determine whether any family-group names based on other genera included in the PORITIDAE (or on their synonyms) have ever been proposed.

3. When were the names *Galaxea* and *Mussa* first published by an author later than Oken (1815)? If there are no intervening synonyms, these names could be retained and re-attributed to their proper authors and dates under the Code.

The first use of *Galaxea* following Oken (1815) was that of Milne-Edwards & Haime (1851, p. 70), who provided a diagnosis as well as a reference to Oken's work. According to Wells (1956, p. F412), *Galaxea* has no junior synonyms; therefore authorship of this genus could be attributed to Milne-Edwards & Haime, 1851 with no further repercussions. It is unnecessary to conserve Oken (1815) as author of this genus. Milne-Edwards & Haime (1851, pp. 70–71) included 13 nominal species in *Galaxea* without naming a type species. As *Galaxea fascicularis* was listed among them, Vaughan's (1918) designation of this species as the type species of *Galaxea* remains valid but the generic name remains threatened by *Porites* Cuvier, 1798, as described in Prof Potts's application.

According to Matthai (1928, p. 202), the first use of *Mussa* following Oken (1815) was by Dana (1848) [sic] (actually 1846, S.D. Cairns, pers. comm.). According to Wells (1956, p. F418), there is an intervening junior synonym *Lithodendron* Schweigger, 1819 which would thus replace *Mussa* if Oken's authority is not approved. Prof Potts stated that *Mussa* has perhaps only two valid species, so replacement of *Mussa* by *Lithodendron*, while undesirable, might not be intolerable. *Lithodendron* and *Mussa* share the same type species *Madrepora angulosa* Pallas, 1766 therefore the priority threat posed by *Porites* Cuvier also exists for *Lithodendron*.

4. Family-group names would not be endangered whether *Porites* Cuvier replaced *Galaxea*, *Mussa* or *Dendrophyllia* as a senior synonym. All three family-group names based on these genera (GALAXEINAE Vaughan & Wells, 1943, MUSSIDAE Ortmann, 1890 and DENDROPHYLLIDAE Gray, 1847) would remain unchanged because *Porites* Cuvier is not the basis of any available family-group name and because the replacement would have taken place after 1961 (see Article 40.2). It is unnecessary for them to be placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology as Prof Potts has proposed.

5. What criteria should be used for choosing a type species for *Porites* Cuvier if it is not suppressed, and thus to determine whether *Porites* would replace *Galaxea*, *Mussa* or *Dendrophyllia*?

*Dendrophyllia* is by far the most speciose genus threatened. It serves as the basis of higher level taxa up to the suborder and has no problems of authorship so it should be retained under any circumstance. As shown above, *Galaxea* also has no problems of authorship or synonyms even if Oken (1815) remains disallowed. The generic name *Mussa* would be replaced anyway if not made available from Oken (1815) therefore its replacement by *Porites* Cuvier would probably be least disruptive of the three choices. Perhaps the application by Prof Potts could have been made simpler by including a designation of *Madrepora angulosa* as type species of *Porites* Cuvier, thus making *Mussa* its objective junior synonym. Then all that would be needed is conservation and inclusion in the Official List of *Mussa* (or *Lithodendron*, if the Commission votes against the availability of *Mussa* from Oken (1815)). *Dendrophyllia* and *Galaxea* would no longer require special attention in this regard.

**Additional references**

- Dana, J.D.** 1846. *United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842 under the command of Charles Wilkes, U.S.N.*, vol. 7. Zoophytes. vii. 740 pp. Philadelphia.
- Duchaissing, P. & Michelotti, J.** 1860. Mémoire sur les coralliaires des Antilles. *Memorie della Reale Accademia della Scienze de Torino*, (2)19: 279–365.
- Matthai, G.** 1928. A monograph of the Recent meandroid *Astraeidae*. *Catalogue of the madreporarian corals in the British Museum (Natural History)*, vol. 7. v. 288 pp. London.
- Milne-Edwards, H. & Haime, J.** 1851. Monographie des polypiers fossiles des terrains paléozoïques. précédée d'un tableau général de la classification des polypes. *Archives du Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris*, 5: 1–502.
- Schweigger, A.F.** 1819. *Beobachtungen auf naturhistorischen Reisen ... Anatomisch-physiologische Untersuchungen über Corallen: nebst ein Anhang, Bemerkungen über die Bernstein enthaltend*. xii, 127 pp. Berlin.

**Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Achatina jani*****De Betta & Martinati, 1855 (currently *Cecilioides jani*; Mollusca, Gastropoda)**

(Case 3233; see BZN 59: 77–81)

(1) Ruud A. Bank

*Graan voor Visch 15318, NL-2132 EL Hoofddorp, The Netherlands*

Gerhard Falkner

*Bayerische Staatssammlung für Paläontologie und historische Geologie, Richard-Wagner-Strasse 10111, D-80333 München, Germany*

Edmund Gittenberger

*Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9517, NL-2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands*

We ask the Commission, for the sake of universality in the scientific names of animals, not to make use of its plenary power to suppress the name *Cecilioides veneta* in favour of *C. jani*. The reason for this is that we do not agree with Giusti & Manganelli (BZN 59: 79) that *C. veneta* (Strobel, 1855) is a 'virtually unused name'. In the last hundred years, *C. veneta* has been used in two well-known monographs dealing with the malacofauna of the Südtirol (Riezler, 1929, p. 161) and the Dolomites (Thorson, 1930, p. 229). In addition, we do not agree with Giusti & Manganelli (BZN 59: 77) that, after the publication of De Betta's work (1864), the specific name of *C. jani* (De Betta & Martinati, 1855) was used 'by virtually all subsequent authors'. In fact, the name *C. aciculoides* (De Cristofori & Jan, 1832) was used for the snail species under consideration by Ehrmann (1933, p. 78), Eder (1914, p. 85), Mermod (1930, p. 371) and Jaekel (1962, p. 147). Only after Giusti's 1976 work was *C. jani* used for this *Cecilioides* species.

Recently the name *C. veneta* has been used in two important monographs: the Checklist of the European Continental Mollusca (CLECOM checklist) (Falkner, Bank & von Proschwitz, 2001, p. 45) and the checklist of French continental molluscs (Falkner, Ripken & Falkner, 2002, pp. 42, 116). The primary goal of the CLECOM initiative is to produce a stable nomenclature for European non-marine molluscs by carrying out nomenclatural revisions based on the provisions of the Code. The CLECOM initiative is widely accepted.